That's the first date when 1 0 Okay. 2 you present to Mr. Bond the offers with the 3 two levels of carriage we discussed privately that have the various costs associated with 4 5 them that we discussed privately, correct? I believe that's correct. 6 Α 7 Okay. And then, you have your 8 followup conversation with Mr. Bond that you 9 reference in paragraph 28, is that right? 10 Which you date as being at June 9, 2009. 11 Α Yes. Correct? So there I think we have 12 0 the dates, Your Honor. 13 14 JUDGE SIPPEL: Just those two 15 dates. 16 BY MR. CARROLL: 17 Q They are the ones that you are 18 focused on. Is that right, sir? 19 JUDGE SIPPEL: Go ahead. I'm 20 sorry, Mr. Solomon. 21 THE WITNESS: Are they the ones 22 that you want me to focus on?

JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.

And June 9th

22

Do you remember also telling Mr.

22

Q.

Bond that you weren't interested in any half
means anymore? Half measures -- do you
remember using the phrase -- telling Mr. Bond,
"I'm not interested in half measures. This is
a waste of time"?

A I recall the waste of time being discussed in response to his suggestion that we should go back to a market-by-market scenario.

Q Well, it was discussed, you said "This would be a waste of time." Right?

A I think I said "that would be a waste of time."

Q And did you also say you weren't interested in half measures? Yes or no.

A I don't recall specifically one way or the other.

Q You don't recall one way or another. So you're not denying it may have been said; you don't have a recall well enough to tell us whether you said it or not.

A And I'm not sure what the context

of that would have been.

Q Isn't it a fact that Mr. Bond did make a counter-proposal to you?

A No.

Q Didn't he propose to you that he would be willing to work and talk about specific markets, region by region, and talk about whether it made sense to give you greater distribution in certain regions, where maybe tennis was more popular in the U.S. than in others?

In other words, he proposed a region by region approach. Isn't that correct?

A I think he did propose that.

Q Isn't it also the case -- and you told him when he proposed that, "That's a waste of time. I'm not interested." Correct?

A We told him that -- first of all, that wasn't, in our minds, a counter to what we had made, which was a national offer.

Q Ah. So you're saying because you

didn't consider it a counter-offer, that's why you testified earlier today that no counter-3 offer was made.

1

2

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Α That was an option that was already on the table, and wasn't new -- what he was introducing was not an offer, because it was something that we were already able to do.

You are not denying that he made 0 that offer, and you are not denying that you were the one who cut it off by saying "That would be a waste of time." Correct?

I think he said that. Whether or not it's an offer -- I guess you could tell me what you think it is. I don't think that was a counter-offer in any way to what we had been talking about or, substantitively, what we had been discussing.

0 And it is the case that tennis, by the way, is more popular in some regions of the country than others. In fact, you rank the cities throughout the countries based upon 1 | what your best tennis cities are, right?

that?

A I think the USTA does that. There are rankings that come out.

Q And you use them. Your people use them to target areas and cities where you think your programming might be more popular, correct?

A In the past, that may have been done. It's not something that we do currently on an active basis.

Q Now, in addition -- I didn't hear you mention this in your direct testimony, so let me just clarify this. Do you not remember that Mr. Bond also told you that your offer wasn't agreeable to him because it would dramatically increase Comcast's cost?

Do you deny that Mr. Bond told you

A I don't deny that.

Q Okay. So to sum it, he told you it would cost too much, offered to go by and discuss region by region, you told him that

was a waste of time, and that's how everything ended on this June date in 2009. Correct?

- A It's --
- Q Correct, sir?
- A Okay, yes.

Q All right. Let's move off of that. I want to go back in time to when you first joined Tennis Channel. You first joined in April of 2005, correct?

A Yes.

Q And did you have any experience with a sports channel before you came to the Tennis Channel?

A I'd had experience with sports on television, but not with a single-sport network.

Q Okay. The channel that you handled right before you came to Tennis
Channel was Fine Living. That's not a sports channel, is it?

A That's not. We had some sports on there. We had golf-related product and some

	Page 354
1	other things, but we didn't have live
2	coverage.
3	Q And you came to Tennis Channel.
4	And right when you got there, you learned you
5	had some big problems to deal with, correct?
6	A I think there are always
7	challenges to every business.
8	Q There were some things you
9	discovered when you got there that made you
10	very unhappy, and were big problems. Do you
11	remember that?
12	A I'm not sure I can remember
13	specifically, because I'm not sure what you're
14	talking about. But I don't have any reason to
15	disagree.
16	Q Do you remember forming the view,
17	when you arrived shortly after you arrived
18	that the business plan Tennis Channel had
19	was, in your words, "a complete fiction"?
20	A I don't remember that
21	specifically.

Let me see if I can help you by

22

Q

Page 355 1 showing you a document, sir. This is Comcast 2 Exhibit 709. Your Honor, may I? 3 JUDGE SIPPEL: You may. 4 (Whereupon, the document referred 5 to was marked as Comcast Exhibit 709 for identification.) 6 7 MR. CARROLL: Actually, Your 8 Honor, this one is not previously in evidence. 9 This is an exhibit we're going to offer on cross-examination after I establish a 10 foundation for it. 11 12 JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you. 13 MR. CARROLL: Do you recognize 14 this, sir, as an email, the top of the first page -- let me do the Bates numbers first. 15 16 TTCCOM00086519 and 520, two pages of some 17 emails. 18 The top email on the first page, 19 that's an email from you, sir, to a Steve 20 Bellamy at the Tennis Channel dated June 29, 2005. Correct? 21 22 THE WITNESS: Yes.

- Q Shortly after you arrived at Tennis Channel, within a few months?
  - A Yes.
- Q And you're responding to an email Mr. Bellamy sent you, it looks like earlier on the same day, June 29th. Do you see that?
  - A Yes.
- Q Okay. And this is email correspondence you and Mr. Bellamy had not long after you arrived on the scene. And what was Mr. Bellamy's job at the time?
  - A He was president of the channel.
- Q Okay. So this is the CEO -- the new CEO talking to his president. Mr.
- Bellamy, a new president at this time, or had he been there?
  - A He had been there.
    - Q All right. Now, the language that

      I just asked you about. You see in the second

      paragraph of your email, you say midway

      through the second paragraph, first line --

this is on the first page of the exhibit, Your
Honor.

Top email, second paragraph,
starts "On the deal, we are still working on
roll-back model," et cetera. "Truth is," and
this is what I want to ask you about, sir.
"Truth is, our old plan was a complete
fiction, from what I can see. I'm quite
angry, actually. I don't know the ad sales
guy before Frank was, but he should be drawn
and quartered." Do you see that?

A I do.

Q All right. Does this jog your memory?

A Not really. It appears to be written at 11:20 p.m. at night, you know, a couple of days -- a couple of weeks after I got to the channel. So I don't recall it, and it doesn't -- I certainly have no reason to quibble that I wrote it. I don't remember writing it.

Q Do you remember the complete

fiction was that your business model was based on completely inflated advertising revenue numbers and ratings?

A I remember that I thought that the advertising projections at the time by the old team were not in line with what I thought they should be, or what I thought reflected an accurate position at that time.

Q Do you remember they were off by like 80 to 90 percent?

A I don't remember.

Q Do you remember a fellow by the name of Frank Garland?

A I do.

Q Mr. Garland was right in the middle of this process, correct?

A I'm not sure where he -- oh, yes. He was involved in the process. Absolutely.

Q What was his position at the time?

A I think he was running the ad sales department, if I remember correctly.

Q Okay. So he took a close look at

Page 359 1 the ad sales numbers, do you remember? And he 2 communicates to you and Mr. Bellamy that we've 3 got a huge problem, we're using wildly inflated numbers. Do you remember that? 5 Are you saying that Frank Garland 6 said that? I haven't been able to read this 7 whole thing. I don't remember this period of time at all. I mean, it's a long time ago. 8 9 Did he say that? 10 JUDGE SIPPEL: Take your time if 11 you want to read it. 12 THE WITNESS: Is it in here, what 13 you just said? 14 JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. Carroll is just 15 asking the questions. 16 MR. CARROLL: I'm just asking do 17 you remember it. 18 THE WITNESS: I don't remember 19 that. 20 MR. CARROLL: All right. Let me 21 show you another exhibit and see if it helps. 22 May I, Your Honor?

And do you see that Mr. Simon is putting together a summary of the ad sale projections' best, most likely and worst case scenarios, compared to the last presentation to the December 2004 Board. Do you see that?

A Yes.

Q And he says, in a nutshell, the best case scenario is 70 percent less than the December plan, and the worst case scenario approach is a 90 percent haircut. Do you see that?

A I do. I'm sorry, the only question I'm not sure of is to the Board.

Does it say that?

Q Well, do you remember, a plan had been presented? This would have been before you got there. And he's saying there was a December 2004 plan presented to the Board.

I'm not asking you about that.

A Okay.

Q I'm asking you about what you learned when you showed up.

1 A There it is, yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Q And you see he's saying that what we presented to the Board in December 2004 was wildly off. Do you see that?

A I do.

Q Okay. Do you remember this now?

A No.

Q And do you see the second page has a chart of numbers quantifying the best case, most likely case, and worst case? And what's being quantified here are the advertising sales, is that right? Total net ad sales.

A Yes.

Q And net ad sales is one of the ways that you make money in your business, is you sell advertising on your programming.

Correct?

A Yes.

Q And do you see that on the second page there's a series of numbers run out all the way to 2012 on what the revised numbers would look for the net advertising sales? Do

1 you see that?

A I do.

Q Now, do you remember being worried that you had a huge problem because people were worried that you had misled your investors and your own people, and were misleading people about what your operations were really worth?

A No.

Q You don't remember that at all?

A No. Not at this time, no. And it doesn't -- I'm not sure who would have misled who, or what you're talking about. This, again, would have been shortly after I got there.

Q In fairness, I'm not saying that you were the person who was there and misled people previously, but weren't you concerned as the CEO who showed up that, oh my God, we've been misleading people about what we're worth?

A I think I would be concerned with

Page 364 1 accuracy of projections. 2 Well, do you remember that in this 3 occasion? Α No. 4 5 All right. One more exhibit on 6 this, let me show you. This is Exhibit 104, 7 which I believe we have already marked and 8 this one is already in evidence. JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you. 10 MR. CARROLL: We put in front of 11 you what's been marked as Exhibit 104, sir. 12 Again, this is just to try and jog your 13 memory. It's a series of emails. You see the 14 second email down, this is April 26, 2005. After you've arrived, correct? 15 16 THE WITNESS: Yes, I would have 17 seen it shortly after I arrived. 18 BY MR. CARROLL: 19 All right. And you'll see the top 20 email refers to a conference call with Randy,

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

Yes, I would assume so.

Ken -- Ken's you, yes?

Α

21

22

Q So they're getting ready for a conference call with you. And do you see in the second email there's a discussion where Mr. Garland is reporting -- and he's your ad guy -- he's reporting to your CFO on the ad sale revenue projections.

He says "I've known this was far off since I saw the original plan, which was before I started. The longer we go, the more I feel like we are misleading the investors and the management team."

And then -- I won't use the numbers, although these may be public. You would know. He's referring to Fine Living here.

He says "Keep in mind that at,"
and he uses some distribution numbers for Fine
Living, "had ad sales revenue around," and he
gives a price net per home that he then
compares to an estimate Tennis Channel's using
that is twice that amount.

I have done that, Your Honor, so

as not to use the precise numbers. Do you see that, sir?

A I do.

Q Does this now jog your memory that the problem was Mr. Garland realized you were using -- not you, Tennis Channel was using inflated advertising numbers per home, and was nervous about misleading people if that continued?

A That appears to be the substance of his discussion, of his memo. I'm not sure that either of his numbers are necessarily accurate.

Q Did you -- at any rate, after you learned about this, did you correct this? Did you go to your Board or your investors and tell them "We, Tennis Channel, made a mistake, and we used inflated numbers, and the numbers have to be changed"?

A I don't recall this whole specific period. I do remember that the business model was not -- didn't seem to be in line with,

1 necessarily, where the business was.

Inflated versus not hitting a number is something you can debate over. They may have mis-projected, they may have mis-analyzed.

Q Do you remember why they misanalyzed? Do you remember talking to Mr. Garland and learning why it was, what the problem was?

A Again, I don't remember this particular period with any specificity. It was a long time ago.

Q Do you remember learning that the problem is very close to the issue, one of the issues you spoke about on direct? The problem was, they were assuming rating numbers that were above channels like ESPN, and very unrealistic for the size of the viewing audience that Tennis Channel could command.

Do you remember that?

A I don't remember that.

Q No memory at all?

this, and Mr. Garland spoke to you after you

22

1 got there about the fact that the size of your 2 enthusiast group was smaller than golfers, 3 hunters, fishermen, and other groups, and that the rating numbers that were being used for 4 5 the viewership for Tennis Channel were 6 inflated by comparison to what other channels 7 were getting, such as CNN, ESPN, MSNBC? 8 Does this jog your memory at all, 9 sir?

A It doesn't. And just to be clear, you said "you had spoken to Mr. Garland," and I'm not sure what you were referring to.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Q Wasn't Mr. Garland in the chain of communication on the emails we looked at earlier, sir? Look back at Exhibit 726.

A Yes. This was a note from Bill Simon saying that he had a call, presumably in April, coming up on April 26th with Randy and Ken. So I'm not sure if Mr. Garland was involved with that or not, or if I ended up being on that call.

Q Well, no, sir. Go to 726, if you